

## MEETING NOTES

### TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD MANAGEMENT, OPERATIONS, AND INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS (M&O/ITS) TECHNICAL TASK FORCE

**CHAIR:** Alex Verzosa, City of Fairfax

**VICE CHAIRS:** John Frankenhoff, D.C. Division of Transportation  
Donald McCanless, Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority  
Jean Yves Point-du-Jour, Maryland State Highway Administration

**DATE:** Friday, September 21, 2001

**TIME:** 12:30 pm – 3:30 pm

**PLACE:** COG, 777 North Capitol Street, NE  
First Floor, Rooms 4/5

#### ATTENDANCE:

Armen Abrahamian, Prince George's County DPW&T, [aabrahamian@co.pg.md.us](mailto:aabrahamian@co.pg.md.us)  
Jeff Arch, PB Farradyne, [arch@pbworld.com](mailto:arch@pbworld.com)  
Randy Carroll, Maryland Department of Environment, [rcarroll@mde.md.state.us](mailto:rcarroll@mde.md.state.us)  
Tony Clarke, Edwards & Kelcey, [cclarke@ekmail.com](mailto:cclarke@ekmail.com)  
Kathleen Donodeo, WMATA, [kdonodeo@wmata.com](mailto:kdonodeo@wmata.com)  
John Frankenhoff, DDOT, [john.frankenhoff@dc.gov](mailto:john.frankenhoff@dc.gov)  
Craig Franklin, Trichord, [caf@trichord-inc.com](mailto:caf@trichord-inc.com)  
Doug Hansen, Fairfax County DOT, [doug.hansen@co.fairfax.va.us](mailto:doug.hansen@co.fairfax.va.us)  
Pat Harrison, Quality Consultants Group, [qualcongroup@prodigy.net](mailto:qualcongroup@prodigy.net)  
Egua Igbinosun, MDSHA/CHART, [eigbinosun@sha.state.md.us](mailto:eigbinosun@sha.state.md.us)  
Tom Jennings, FHWA- VA Division, [tom.jennings@fhwa.dot.gov](mailto:tom.jennings@fhwa.dot.gov)  
Mark Maggio, George Mason University, [mmaggio@gmu.edu](mailto:mmaggio@gmu.edu)  
Frank Mirack, FHWA  
Glenn McLaughlin, MDSHA/CHART, [gmclaughlin@sha.state.md.us](mailto:gmclaughlin@sha.state.md.us)  
William Raine, WMATA, [wraine@wmata.com](mailto:wraine@wmata.com)  
Jim Robinson, VDOT, [robinson\\_jr@vdot.state.va.us](mailto:robinson_jr@vdot.state.va.us)  
Jeremy Siviter, IBI Group, [jsiviter@ibigroup.com](mailto:jsiviter@ibigroup.com)  
Kenneth Todd, National Council of Bicycling and Walking  
Alex Verzosa, City of Fairfax, [averzosa@ci.fairfax.va.us](mailto:averzosa@ci.fairfax.va.us)  
Emil Wolanin, Montgomery County DPWT, [ewolanin@dpwt.com](mailto:ewolanin@dpwt.com)

**TPB Management, Operations, and ITS Technical Task Force**  
**Notes from the September 21, 2001 Meeting**  
**Page 2**

**COG Staff**

Malaika Abernathy, [mabernathy@mwkog.org](mailto:mabernathy@mwkog.org)

Michael Farrell, [mf Farrell@mwkog.org](mailto:mf Farrell@mwkog.org)

Robert Griffiths, [reg@mwkog.org](mailto:reg@mwkog.org)

Andrew Meese, [ameese@mwkog.org](mailto:ameese@mwkog.org)

Gerald Miller, [gkmiller@mwkog.org](mailto:gkmiller@mwkog.org)

**ACTIONS:**

**1. Review of from the July 27, 2001 Meeting**

Chair Alex Verzosa called the meeting to order at 12:45 pm. No changes were made to the July 27, 2001 meeting notes.

**2. Update from the Professional Capacity Building Working Group and Review of Surveys on Training**

Andrew Meese said that Nora Salinas and Amy Tang were working on surveys used to identify the level of satisfaction and success from ITS courses taken within the year from regional transportation personnel. A final report on the survey results would be discussed during the October 21, 2001 meeting. The survey was distributed to the group.

Mr. Meese suggested committee members visit the T2 Centers websites for upcoming training courses.

**3. Report on Regional ITS Architectures Development**

Jeff Arch and Glenn McLaughlin briefed the committee on the final draft ITS Architecture report. The report included comments and recommendations from the ITS Architecture working group. The project objectives, as discussed by Mr. Arch focused on the following areas:

- Defining interconnects and data flows required to facilitate operations and management issues in the Metropolitan Washington Region.
- Examine regional ITS application interface alternatives.
- Proof of concepts. Conformance of the alternatives were verified with the regional architecture.

Mr. Arch described the project workflow chart, which was divided into the following four major project tasks:

- Task 1—Project kick-off meeting
- Task 2—Inventory of existing and planned ITS projects

**TPB Management, Operations, and ITS Technical Task Force**  
**Notes from the September 21, 2001 Meeting**  
**Page 3**

- Task 3—Develop ITS Regional Architecture;
  - Establish strawman architecture,
  - Refinement and consistency check through validation meetings with key stakeholders.
  - Does the strawman regional architecture agree with regional needs
- Task 4—Identify approaches for electronic exchange of data information elements
  - Identify national ITS architecture and technical standards-based approaches for electronic information exchange
  - Application Interface Mechanism
  - Proof of Concept

In the discussion of the report, coordination efforts among regional entities such as the Maryland and VDOT NOVA Architecture efforts were discussed. Mr. Arch confirmed that coordinating the Metropolitan Washington Regional ITS Architecture with these efforts and other on-going regional activities such as the M&O/ITS Strategic Plan were anticipated for the future.

Mr. Arch stated that the Regional Architecture was an operations-based architecture and was centered on agencies that perform operational functions. Architectural flows that are specific to individual agencies i.e., architecture flows between agency operations centers and their field devices would not be included in this effort.

According to the FHWA rule and FTA policy on ITS Architecture and Standards, this Regional effort was consistent with the final federal requirements as stated below:

- Regions currently implementing ITS projects must have a regional ITS architecture in place in four years.
- ITS projects funded by the Highway Trust Fund and the Mass Transit Account must conform to a regional ITS architecture.
- Major ITS projects should move forward based on a project level architecture that clearly reflects consistency with the National ITS Architecture.

From a regulatory standpoint, all regional and local architectures should and were intended to comply with federal regulations.

In response to a question from Kathleen Donodeo, Mr. Meese stated that based on federal requirements, systems could potentially be better integrated by identifying a sequence of priority projects that if implemented could raise the region's potential to have integrated systems cross agency and jurisdictionally boundaries. The architecture was intended to highlight potential projects that if implemented would enhance regional integration. Although priority projects would be highlighted in the Architecture, regional stakeholders are recommended but not required to implement them.

The relationship between the M&O/ITS Strategic plan and the architecture were discussed.

**TPB Management, Operations, and ITS Technical Task Force**  
**Notes from the September 21, 2001 Meeting**  
**Page 4**

These projects would eventually be mapped against the architecture to identify projects that would support the proof of concept.

An effort to widely distribute the architecture for comments throughout the region was expected.

Mr. Arch invited all comments and questions about the architecture to Mr. McLaughlin's email at [gmclaughlin@sha.state.md.us](mailto:gmclaughlin@sha.state.md.us).

#### **4. Reports from Groups/Focus Areas**

##### **511**

Mr. Meese stated that Todd Kell would be expected to give the committee an update on the status of 511 deployment at the next meeting.

##### **ITS As a Data Resource**

Mr. Meese stated that a draft report for Task 3 was underway by consultants and would be further discussed at a later date.

##### **911**

Emergency response was a primary topic of concern in the aftermath of September 11, 2001 attacks. In a September 19, 2001 *Washington Post* article distributed at the meeting, escalating demands for locating emergency 911 calls placed from cellular telephones were discussed. A federal requirement stated that cellular telephone providers should be able to pinpoint the location of 911 callers within a certain number of meters. As noted in the article, most cellular providers have asked for extensions on an October 1, 2001 deadline to implement such systems, because they are having trouble with a number of equipment and software issues. There are also implications for public safety calling centers needing to be equipped to receive generated geolocation information.

#### **5. Update on New Regional M&O Activities**

Mr. Meese reported on the following regional M&O/ITS activities:

##### **Traffic Signal Problem Reporting System**

- *Concept-* The University of Maryland and George Mason University had volunteered to develop a prototype traffic signal reporting system. The system would be a regional Internet site for the public to submit information on traffic signal malfunctions.  
*Status-* The Universities have developed a prototype system. The working group had reviewed and made suggestions to this system and would be showcased on COG/TPB Website. Each agency involved has control over the information provided on the website.

**TPB Management, Operations, and ITS Technical Task Force**  
**Notes from the September 21, 2001 Meeting**  
**Page 5**

The system should be up and running within this calendar year. Questions about publicizing the site were and will be discussed at future meetings of the working group.

**Pilot Interjurisdictional Arterial Corridors**

- *Concept-* In conjunction with the Traffic Signal Optimization working group, technical personnel had recommended the following two pilot corridors to study M&O activities.
  - Virginia: US 50 from Waples Mill Road to Pershing Drive (Fairfax County, City of Fairfax and Arlington)
  - DC and Maryland: New Hampshire Avenue (Route 650) in Maryland from North Capitol Street to Powder Mill Road (DC, Takoma Park, Prince George's County and Montgomery County)

*Status-* VDOT and MDOT had tasked a consultant to perform field studies on before and after travel times on the aforementioned pilot corridors. These field studies were being implemented during September while school was in session. Due to the events of September 11, Arlington staff has been dedicated to more important activities and questions of including Arlington in the study were discussed. The working group would schedule meetings with other regional stakeholders in the November. Mike Farrell will visit the corridors and address pedestrian and bicycle issues within the study.

**M&O Conference**

- *Concept-* The M&O conference was expected to be a peer-to-peer information exchange event for regional officials in transportation and public safety. The conference would inform officials about ongoing M&O and incident management activities across functional and jurisdictional lines. The event would result in a compendium to serve as an information resource for future M&O activities.

*Status-* Efforts to coordinate with the National Capital Region Incident Management Conference was expected. The conference was hosted by the University of Maryland and Maryland State highway and would be held on November 7 and 8, 2001 at the Redskins Fed Ex Stadium. Agency and vendor displays are expected to be present. The September 11, events will be highlighted at this event. Jean Yves Point-du-Jour welcomed TPB membership to this important regional event.

Ms. Donodeo suggested the conference include transit operators.

**Development of Regional Approach**

Based on discussions between COG staff and TPB Chairman, John Mason, it was suggested that the region discuss and define the role of MPOs. Mr. Meese distributed an excerpt from a report from the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organization (AMPO) discussing federal emphasis of M&O. The role of the MPO should be discussed. The chart highlights potential functions and products expected under various MPO scenarios. The range of the scenarios were

**TPB Management, Operations, and ITS Technical Task Force**  
**Notes from the September 21, 2001 Meeting**  
**Page 6**

discussed by the group and stated that the following two roles could potentially be addressed by this region:

- **Champion of metropolitan level M&O planning:**
  - Functions of the MPO under this role would include:
    - Traditional MPO role
    - Collating performance indicators produced by others
    - Identifying data gaps and agencies to fill gaps
    - Involving elected officials in M&O issues
    - Establishing partnerships, agreements regarding specific M&O plans and projects
    - Managing resources working on M&O issues
  - Products to be expected under this role include:
    - Reports based on existing performance data
    - Partnerships and agreements
    - Specific M&O plans and projects
    - More M&O information and projects in the long-range plan and TIP.
- **Developer of metropolitan level M&O Plans**
  - Functions of the MPO under this role would include (in addition to functions in the above example)
    - Developing and analyzing performance measures
    - Setting M&O priorities, assigning resources to priority M&O projects
    - Assigning responsibility for M&O priority projects to agencies
    - Developing performance based TIP and M&O component of the CLRP
  - Products to be expected under this role include:
    - CLRP with full M&O component
    - Performance based TIP
    - Performance reports, including assessment of issues, opportunities and priorities
    - Detailed plans for specific M&O programs and projects, including funding.

## **6. Discussion of Regional Performance Measures**

Mr. Meese stated that the ad hoc working group has developed regional M&O performance measures. A significant step in bringing an M&O orientation to the regional transportation planning process was the development of regional performance measures. The group has established the following five categories to develop regional performance measures in:

- **System Quality**—Describes travel conditions and the effects of recurring congestion. Example measures could be level of service, % of freeway segments that are congested or transit load factors

**TPB Management, Operations, and ITS Technical Task Force**  
**Notes from the September 21, 2001 Meeting**  
**Page 7**

- Reliability of Travel—Indicates day-to-day, hour-to-hour variations and disruptions. Example measures were standard deviation of travel times as reported by Partners In Motion traffic reports, transit on-time performance of rail and bus.
- Safety—Indicators related to crashes. Example potential measures were crashes injuries, fatalities (by rate, by VMT, etc.), highway, transit, bicycle and pedestrian.
- Impact of Traffic Management Centers and Systems—Indicators related to activities undertaken by centers or equipment that manage or operate the transportation system. Impacts on secondary incidents and on incident duration were a few potential examples.
- Customer Satisfaction—Opinions and reactions of customers of the transportation systems as obtained from sample surveys of the public, similar to recent FHWA, WMATA, and VDOT surveys. This measure could potentially highlight consumers perceived reasons for travel delay, satisfaction with attributes of the highway or support of M&O activities.

An additional category to focus on was:

- Context of system characteristics and utilization—This category would describe the size of the transportation system and the quantity of travel. Potential information that could be included in this section could be miles of highway, transit lines, HOV, vehicle miles traveled (VMT), transit ridership, levels of telework for example.

The end product of this effort would be presented to the second annual *Report to the Region on Transportation*, to be held on November 28, 2001 at Union Station. Under each category, a few regional facts were intended to be displayed. These facts would be intended to tell a story about the regional transportation system. A follow up document, similar to that of the San Jose report, documenting about 10-20 pages with illustrations, maps, graphics, text for policy-level and public discussion would be made. Performance measures would be listed in a technical report for use by technical personnel.

In the discussion, Ms. Donodeo suggested that the committee stay away from measures that use travel demand modeling data, such as air quality indicators. She said that these types of indicators are not performance measures but a prediction of future trends and should not be confused with each other.

Mr. Meese informed the group of a collaborative effort among TPB staff, Mitretek and FHWA, where the SmarTraveler database was used to provide unprecedented information on 33 segments within the region. From this database, information on variability, causality and other qualitative and quantitative information on the transportation system could be assessed. A good example of information received from this database was that the standard deviation of reported

**TPB Management, Operations, and ITS Technical Task Force**  
**Notes from the September 21, 2001 Meeting**  
**Page 8**

travel time during morning rush hour period was 43%. HOV lanes were not reported on, but could potentially be reported.

A handout depicting local breakdown of the results from the “Moving Ahead” study were discussed. The sample size was quite small for this large geographic area, showing only 49 respondents. Staff also put together the charts comparing DC, Maryland, and Virginia results with the nationwide results. The regional results are by and large, statistically quite similar to the nationwide results. With such caveats, staff recommends, that the breakdown figures not be reported on. Also, Mr. Meese stated that a follow-up survey for our metropolitan area was under consideration and discussion among VDOT, George Mason University and TPB staff.

**7. M&O/ITS Unfunded Opportunities List**

Mr. Meese distributed a memo on a proposal to redefine the unfunded opportunities list that was produced last year to aid discussions of the Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) funding needs. Mr. Meese suggested that the committee use one category titled M&O/ITS and develop an annualized “unfunded need” cost estimate for the entire M&O/ITS category. Five-to-ten sample projects, with cost estimates and descriptions of potential benefits would also be identified by the group. Mr. Meese stated that the ITS Regional Architecture could be used as a reference in establishing the list. The list would include projects that would be implemented if additional funding were available.

Mr. Verzosa adjourned the meeting at 3:40 pm